THE NEW IDEAL.

VOL. III. JUNE, 1890. No. 6.

UNITARIANISM.

I WISH to say a word on the subject of Unitarianism. This was a *system*, not a *process;* and, as a system, it rested upon the old foundations of revealed religion; namely, an infallible scripture, a truth attested by miracle, an individual God, an immediate providence, an inspired Saviour, a private immortality, a damaged and impotent humanity. It was, in short, a modified orthodoxy. Not a repudiated one, not an outgrown and disavowed one, but simply a diluted one. Edward Everett, on being "approbated" as a minister by the Boston Association, asserted his full belief in the bible as containing all moral and spiritual truth. This is now called "old fashioned" Unitarianism, but in truth it was and is "Unitarianism," the unadulterated thing.

Strictly speaking, Channing was not a Unitarian, for he introduced a new and uncongenial principle,— namely, the intrinsic worth of human nature,— which struck at the heart of orthodoxy in every form, and consequently of Unitarianism — an attenuated kind of orthodoxy, with just enough of humane sentiment to revolt against the harsher doctrines of Calvinism, and just criticism enough to discard the trinity, the deity of Jesus, and the literal inspiration of the bible. This principle was never fully carried out by Channing, who, to the last, clung to many of the speculative traditions he had been brought up in, and which were too heavy to be thrown off in a life-time such as his was,— a life-time of physical infirmity and ministerial duty. Surprisingly little of the ancient dogmatism hung about him as it was,— none of its temper; and if he had had time he might have got rid of it all. But this was impossible to his mental force. Perhaps his reluctance to be called a Unitarian was in part owing to a consciousness that he had not entirely vindicated his own position.

Neither was Theodore Parker a Unitarian, though he tried hard to make it appear so. His adoption of Channing's idea, coupled with critical knowledge, rendered it

easy for him to find fault with Unitarianism as well as to reject every form of orthodoxy; but he so overworked the intuitive principle by making it responsible for definite tenets of theism — an individual God, for instance, private immortality, the authority of moral law — as to destroy his speculative influence over future generations. In his famous "Letter to the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers," he says,— "I have not touched the great philosophical questions which lie at the bottom of all theology." But these questions were vital; the others were quite secondary; and if he *had* touched them he might have spared himself the trouble of writing his long letter. His opponents did not appreciate the true cause of difference as clearly as he did. If they had, the fundamental divergence would have been evident. They were *Sensationalists*, he was an *Intuitionalist*, and, of course, the starting-points were opposite. It must be remembered that the Unitarians, being engaged by details of doctrine, took the foundations for granted and could not suppose that the dispute involved radical principles of thought. They presumed that those were settled, that the sole remaining duty was to draw out the full truth contained in the Divine Word. Of some things they were sure; of others they were uncertain; but they never doubted that they were on the right track. So far as they went they had no misgivings. But outside of the Scriptures there was no assurance, no certainty, and when revelation was abandoned there was no reliance left.

The new Unitarianism, as it is called, is not a development from the old system. It is not a continuance of Channing or Parker. It is the product of another spirit,— of thought, of knowledge, of science, of sentiment. It is more interested in sociology than in theology, in literature than in the bible, in life than in the soul, in man than in "Christ." It is not "transcendental"; it is not "sensational"; it believes in *experience*. It is a form of theism; not of the old, literal theism of half a century ago, with its dogmas of an individual God, a particular providence, an immortality of rewards and punishments, prayer of supplication; but a spiritual theism, rational, broad, sympathetic, open to fresh views, elastic, hospitable, hopeful.

When such men as —— and —— and —— call themselves Unitarians they certainly are not thinking of the dogmatical presuppositions attached to the name, but of its capacities for expansion. The name stands to them for all that is rich, free, positive, advanced, humane. And so long as they can stay within the organization without conflict or protest, so long as they are welcomed, they — for reasons of their own — remain where they are and accept the des-

ignation. They represent, so far as their love of intellectual liberty goes, the majority of the denomination. It may be questioned whether any considerable number of men would assent to the old creed or submit to the ancient conditions. Indeed, few know what they are, so completely are the beliefs of the fathers forgotten. The first Unitarianism meant inquiry; the last must mean inquiry also. The spirit of the faith was liberal whatever its articles may have been.

This is an old story; it has been told again and again. As far back as Parker's day, nay, earlier, the same matter was debated, and it was questioned by what right an independent thinker could call himself Unitarian. But now the title is much more inclusive than it was then. Perhaps it would be wiser to drop the appellation and substitute that of Theism; but this too is subject to discussion, as every general name is. Even the term Independent must be explained.

O. B. Frothingham.

WAGES AND TARIFFS.

Wages are high in this country; and I am glad they are; but there is no necessary connection of high wages with high tariffs. Wages are just as high in New South Wales, where eight hours make a day's work, and where the tariff is for revenue only. Wages are higher under free trade in England than under protection in France, Germany and Italy; they rose ten per cent. in England, between 1872 and 1883, while they fell five per cent. in Massachusetts, according to the Report of the State Bureau of Labor for 1884; and the British laborer is twice as well off now as he was under protection fifty years ago. Russia has almost as high a tariff as ours; and men are working there for 20 cents a day. No country has tried harder to keep out foreign goods than China; and the laborers of no other country are so poorly fed. Americans earned more than Europeans before the Revolutionary war, when British industries were protected and ours were under the ban. We had low tariffs, with but little intermission, for thirty years before the war; and travelers in the United States said: "Nothing is easier than to live by labor and live well." "There are no poor." "None are condemned to abject poverty." "We have met with no beggars, witnessed no signs of want, but have seen everywhere the most unequivocal proofs of prosperity and rapid progress." All the men and women in the streets of New York were well dressed; and the operatives

in Lowell looked, says Lyell, like "a set of gentlemen and ladies playing at factory for their own amusement." Emigration from England was at its height forty years ago, but wages in our factories rose nearly twenty per cent. between 1850 and 1860. In short, wages are and have been high here, because we have a great and rich country, not because we have a big tariff.

The countries where wages are high agree among themselves, and surpass countries where wages are low, in the great productiveness of their industries and efficiency of their laborers. Wages are low in Russia, in spite of her high tariff; and it costs six times as much to get an acre of grass cut by Russian as by English peasants. A Hindoo can be hired to work on a railroad for a dime a day; and the railroad will cost fully as much, per mile, as if it were made by Englishmen. No wonder wages are higher in England than in Russia or India; especially as England is an unrivalled exporter of high-priced products. Wages are higher here than even in England; and Mr. Blaine has stated that "undoubtedly the inequalities in the wages of English and American operatives are more than neutralized by the greater efficiency of the latter, and their longer hours of labor." Another protectionist Secretary of State, Senator Evarts, reported that "the average American workman performs from one and one-half to twice as much work in a given time as the average European workman"; and a third protectionist, Mr. Charles S. Hill, has brought forward "positive proof that American mechanics, in the aggregate, accomplish exactly double the result of the same number of British mechanics." That champion of high tariff, the *New York Press*, declares that "The better paid American laborer makes three times as many shoes a week as the Englishman does." It has been found that a boot which can be made for 35 cents in Lynn costs 77 in Vienna; and similar facts have been ascertained in regard to carpets, woolen cloth, and cotton-goods. Our factories pay large wages because they turn out large quantities of salable goods.

Is it on account of our tariff that a watch-maker is paid better than a hod-carrier? The best wages go to the man who does the most valuable work; and this is just as true of an American against a Russian, as of a watch-maker against a hod-carrier. Wages depend on production; and only as a tariff affects productiveness can it possibly affect wages. Any country, productive enough to supply abundantly all the wants of civilized people, must of necessity be a place where labor is paid well, whatever the tariff.

The question how rate of wages is affected by increase in number of laborers is one about which there is no differ-

ence between free-traders and protectionists. Men have always come in free of duty; what restriction there is on bringing in contract-labor forms no part of the tariff; there is a constant increase of our population through births as well as through immigration from our protected neighbors; and every new machine for saving labor drives numbers of operatives to seek employment in other trades. The supply of seekers for work increases rapidly; and if the supply of work does not increase just as fast, wages must inevitably fall. The welfare of the operative requires that productiveness should outstrip population. Greater increase of population than production means lower wages. Rate of wages depends on value of production in proportion to population; and the only way a tariff can possibly affect wages is by affecting production. Thus, all we need to know about the tariff, as respects wages, is whether protection encourages the greatest possible productiveness; if it does, it is the wage-earner's friend, if it does not, it is his enemy. He was told in 1879, by a Republican Secretary of State, "Unless we can extend the markets for our manufactures he cannot expect steady work." The better the market, the larger will be the product of the factory, and the higher the wages.

One of the most serious checks upon production, in the United States, has been the danger of glutting the market. Twenty years ago, for instance, blast-furnaces sprang up like mushrooms, under stimulus of the duty on pig-iron. So much of it was made that it had to be sold under the hammer, at less than the duty which would have been paid for importation. Half of the furnaces shut down; and the discharged operatives generally became tramps,— for other industries besides had produced more than could be sold at a profit. After that, people kept talking and writing about the evils of over-production, until the discovery of a remedy which has proved worse than the disease. We are protected against over-production by the trusts. When more goods are likely to be manufactured than can be sold at high prices, the makers conspire to keep down production; which involves keeping down wages also. About two years ago, the Sugar Trust was discharging laborers in order to keep sugar high and scarce. A pamphlet on "Labor, Wages, and Tariffs," published in January by the Reform Club, 52 William Street, New York city, devotes four pages in fine print to brief items about cases of reduction of wages, and of strikes in consequence, since Harrison's election. A protectionist organ, already quoted, said last December, "The year closes with little improvement in the industrial situation. Strikes and lock-outs are reported in every direction. Here and there, the strike is a demand for higher

wages. In most cases it is simply declared in passive and stubborn resistance to attempted reductions."

No one, so far as I know, has questioned the accuracy of the statement made by Representative W. C. P. Breckinridge in the *Forum* for November, 1888, that in all the great "protected" industries the factories can turn out in seven months goods enough to supply the present market for the year, so that the operatives must pass five months without employment, or else get only seven months' pay for twelve months of work. It has been recently stated in the *Forum*, as well as in the *North American Review*, that our factories "can turn out a third more product than our people can consume." Our State Bureau of Statistics of Labor published, in 1887, a Report about the Unemployed; and in this book it is shown, not only that the average Massachusetts factory was closed for one-fourth of the year 1885, but that the cause, in nearly every instance, was "slack trade." Among the goods whose production was suspended for more than three months, were carpets, clocks, watches, whips, and worsteds. The Hartford Carpet Company, which employs nearly two thousand hands, has just been obliged by a glut in the market to cut down wages ten per cent.; and similar items meet our eyes daily.

Plainly, our wage-earners need markets in which there is no danger of glut, and no excuse for cuts, lock-outs, or trusts. The home market is not large enough for either factory or farm; and to keep the factory down within domestic limits means low wages but not cheap goods. A country whose factories cannot afford to run all the year is like that German principality whose sovereign refused the present of a telescopic rifle, because he had not room enough to set up a target inside of his dominions. What should we think of a lawyer afraid of winning too many cases, or a doctor of curing patients, or a preacher of making converts? But these men would be enlightened philanthropists in comparison with the manufacturer who joins a trust in order not to make too many goods. The market which encourages a policy so injurious to both operatives and consumers is plainly too narrow, and ought to be enlarged at once. The champions of protectionism, like Secretary Blaine and Senator Morrill, declare that American locomotives, agricultural implements, carriages, pianos, watches, paper, boots and shoes, cotton goods, and many kinds of hardware already find good markets abroad; and it is to be noticed that these are all the products of labor which is highly paid, but which is really cheaper than that of other countries, considering the value of the work. Those articles in whose manufacture the largest part of the cost goes to the workman are precisely those in which America is

able to compete against all the world. A home market is good as far as it goes; but the world's market is much better, especially for operatives, as England found out long ago. She exported fifteen times as many dollars' worth of hardware as we did, in 1880; but the largest manufacturer of it in the world, Mr. J. B. Sargent of New Haven, who employs two thousand men in a good season and turns out fifty tons a day, says he could sell four times as much if it were not for the duty on his materials, which cost higher here than abroad, while labor is cheaper. "In articles requiring a large amount of labor and a comparatively small amount of raw material, we can hold our own with any foreigners; where the raw material is large in proportion to the labor, the Englishman is on top." His own exports consist almost entirely of light, fancy articles; and he has no sale abroad for heavy hinges, bolts, and staples, requiring much iron but little work, whereas, he continues, "If it were not for the duty on raw materials, I could send out a hundred and eighty tons a day to foreign markets." "These heavy goods cost manufacturers at least thirty per cent. too much, because of the duty on raw material. If that duty were removed, I for one would apply ten per cent. of the saving to underselling the English in foreign markets; I would add ten per cent. to the wages of my men; and the other ten would go nicely in my own pockets." So the agent of the Bristol Clock Company, employing five hundred hands who are paid $2 a day on the average, says he can turn out articles at one-half of the labor-cost in Germany; yet he cannot compete with the Germans, because he is taxed more than sixty per cent. on his raw materials. "We could undersell our foreign competitors in any market in the world, and give a better article, if it were not for this exorbitant and merciless tax. Let us have a reformed tariff, and we will enlarge our works, and within a year employ half as many again workmen, at wages averaging $2.50 a day." This state of things has led nearly six hundred proprietors and managers of iron-working establishments in New England to petition for the reduction of the duties on ore, coal, and coke; and Ex-Governor Ames was among the signers. The effect of taxing wool thus far can easily be compared with that of letting the shoe-shops have free hides. The best thing the tariff could do for American operatives is to let the employer get his raw material free of duty, as is the case with his rivals in France, Germany, Belgium, Great Britain and Canada. Most countries which are protectionist otherwise, know enough to have free trade in this respect.

Here we reach a point concerning which much has just been said in Congress, and on which the election this fall will

turn. I will not now dwell on it longer, but pass to other points, which are already discussed in Congress and will in their turn become prominent. One of these is that our manufacturing industries are so numerous that it is almost impossible to help any branch without injuring others. For instance, the McKinley Bill proposes to double the duty on window-glass. This may be a good thing for the glass-blower; but every other manufacturer will find it hinder him from extending, or even keeping up his buildings. Then again, tin-plate is used as raw material by 750,000 Americans, employed in making kitchen-utensils, cans, etc.; and the tin cans furnish an important way of disposing of meat, fish, fruit, and vegetables. The sale of these canned goods would be much greater if tin plate were not subjected to a duty of thirty-three per cent., which really protects nobody, as no tin-plate is manufactured in the United States. It was perhaps in the hope that some might be, that the duty has been kept up. The Democrats tried in vain to take it off in 1888; and now the Republicans threaten to double it. The McKinley Bill would raise the duty to seventy per cent., at the risk of closing half our canning factories, and seriously injuring the market now open to our farmers, fishermen, fruit-growers and market-gardeners. The addition of a dollar a box to the price of canned goods would hinder not only their exportation, but their home consumption. Many an American woman is already in doubt whether to buy her soups, preserves, etc., canned, or prepare them herself from fresh materials; and a slight difference in cost will turn the scale. Raising the duty may make two or three rich manufacturers richer; but where work is given to one operative, it will be taken away from at least a dozen. One leading protectionist, Major Butterworth, has spoken against the measure in Congress; and it ought to fail.

It might be hoped that, in this and other cases, there would be a survival of the fittest industry; but I must make still another objection to protective tariffs,—namely, that they are provisions for the survival of the unfit. How well our leading branches of manufacturing could do without protection is shown, not only by their actual success in competition in foreign markets, but by their great prosperity, expressly admitted in Blaine's "Twenty Years of Congress," under the low tariffs of 1846 and 1857. Between 1850 and 1860, the annual value of our factory-products increased eighty-six per cent.,—twice as fast as our population; the gains in total amount of factory-wages, and in capital employed in manufacturing, were two or three times as great as between 1870 and 1880; and our exports of manufactured goods quadrupled in value between 1846 and

1860. Our iron industry is much older than our national existence, and is already competing so successfully in all markets as to make it much wiser to encourage its extension, by letting it buy ore and coal abroad with its products, than to restrict its liberty of providing itself with raw materials, and thus take away employment from its operatives, while our mines are being exhausted with a rapidity which we may have reason to regret. It is better for our men to be employed at high wages in making hardware for foreign markets, than at low wages in dragging out coal and iron which we may need badly by-and-by. So there would be a great check to the consumption of woolen goods in the United States, if the McKinley plan is carried out, of raising all duties, and especially those on the cheapest and coarsest goods, so high as to make poor women pay two or three times as much for yarn, flannels, stockings, hats, shawls, blankets, and cloth, as they would if it were not for the tariff. Old things would be made to last longer by rich people, as well as by poor. Factories would find it even harder than now to keep open all the year. And the reduction in wages would be so great as to more than make up for any possible advantage to be gained by the plan which is proposed as an excuse for the increase of taxation, — namely, the introduction into this country of certain breeds of sheep which are not so profitable as those we have already. Better to let our factories turn out goods cheap enough to buy wool abroad, than make them turn out their operatives in order to have the wool-grower produce carpet-wool for a falling market.

There is a great demand abroad, as well as at home, for our pianos, and other furniture, wooden-ware, wagons, carriages, and other articles for which lumber is the raw material; but here again the duty checks the demand for skilled labor, in order to give employment at comparatively low wages to the destroyers of our own forests, with the result of increasing inclemency of climate and devastation from floods. Better to export more wooden goods to Canada, and let her forests be cut off instead of ours. Raw silk has, hitherto, been imported free by our mills, from countries where its producers earn much less than would satisfy any laborer here; but it is now proposed to make this industry remunerative here by paying a bounty of a dollar a pound for reeling it off from the cocoons; thus all our successful and necessary industries are to be burdened for a mere chance of starting an utterly needless one; and the work of reeling off silk is so tedious and unremunerative that it will undoubtedly soon be abandoned, as was the case, in spite of great efforts, in 1839. If the silk-worm should be naturalized, it will soon be protected by increasing the

duties, not only on raw silk but on all articles manufactured out of it; and we should have higher prices, smaller sales, less work in the mills, and lower wages. A tariff which threatens to cripple our most successful branches of manufacture in order to have raw silk, tin plate, and carpet wool produced in America at fancy prices, or to exhaust American mines and forests, is nothing better than an attempt to secure the survival of the unfit.

It is easy to see that our tariff checks production in so many ways as to cause wages to be decidedly lower than they would otherwise be. There are exceptional cases, in which protection gives vast profits; but it must be remembered that these are not for the laborer, but for the employer. It sounds well to say that the tariff gives seventeen dollars of extra gain on every ton of steel-rails; but it must be remembered that the man who makes them gets only three dollars for the work; and it is very doubtful whether the part of that sum, due to the tariff, is great enough to make up for the extent to which the prices of most things he buys are increased. Nothing is plainer than the fact that whatever protection is given is at the expense of the consumer; and here the workingman is sure to be the loser, while there is little reason to suppose him to be a gainer anywhere. There is good reason to believe that his cost of living is increased ten per cent. by the present tariff; and the burden of the one now proposed would be greater still. Grand-Master Powderly spoke the simple truth, last November, when he said:

> "It seems to me that the policy of protection is a wrong on labor. The laboring classes are not protected — only the manufacturers. The rich receive the protection. The American manufacturer adds the duty to what should be the natural and fair price for his product. The burden of the tariff rests its crushing weight upon the poor. The tariff needs reforming. It is the poor, the great mass of the people, who need protection, and they will never get it under the so-called policy of protection."

F. M. Holland.

HUMAN CAPACITY FOR IMMORTALITY.

Nature is in evolution,— at least in continued movement,— and human consciousness has arrived at a point where it can, to some extent, co-operate with Nature. That is, we have mind (human will and intelligence) "taking a hand," so to speak, however feebly, in the very movement that has evolved and developed it, or at least permitted it to grow up.

Into the problem of human destiny, then, Humanity

enters as a factor,— at the point of conscious co-operation. And, if Humanity be a factor, it is evidently a factor of accelerating, or higher and higher potency,— like a progression where, every time a certain factor appears or reappears, it exhibits a higher exponent. And this is a meager figure, for *our* factor has other than mathematical properties; it is finer in quality as well as higher in degree, and has also an element of increasing obviousness.

A word might well be here interjected as to the *origin* and *why* of Nature, which has evolved, produced or allowed to be developed this so wonderful mankind. But the writer is not instructed on either of these points; whoever may be garrulous here, he must be dumb. We are human atoms,— pimples of the universe,— and the molecule all we human individuals together help to make up may itself be nothing more than an atom or molecule in some broader system and higher mind. Educated theologians, instructed laymen, seers, poets or prophets may know! the writer does not know, and speculation he feels to be unprofitable except as a kind of mental calisthenics.

But man, an enigma if we consider the individual, and a scientific problem if we consider the race or Humanity, interests us,— at least such of us as are not quite clods, steeped in that stupidity against which the gods are said to contend in vain.

Is immortality a property of the individual? Can the human atom be saved — endowed with eternal life? Heber Newton says, "If immortality be a fact it must be a *material* fact. . . . We know nothing of mind apart from matter." Certainly, if there be anything in individual man *worth* saving, it will be saved. The "economy" of Nature, of grace, or of Deity itself, phrase it as you please, will not, cannot permit it to be "lost"; it is and will be saved now and forevermore. And we were poor, selfish atoms indeed to even wish to have it otherwise; that is, to desire to have something "saved" or made immortal which were really valueless and unworthy, no matter how dear to us. It is not a question as to the designs and purposes of the Great First Cause so much as of *capacity in us.*

Has mankind yet produced an individual having such worth and capacity? Who dare answer Yea?—for it is not the atom's *self valuation* that counts. The fixer of valuation is that which is outside the atom, outside of Humanity,— yet immanent, as we are driven to think, in matter and in man. Not a power, but a greater than all power; not a mind, but a something beyond all mind; a being, you may suggest, but a greater than all being, and for whom there are absolutely no words and no adequate ideas. It is simply beyond the realm of loftiest thought,— absolute,

unconditioned, incomparable, inconceivable. The writer dare not think Humanity has yet produced a single specimen able to meet the test — not one!

Earth's best and bravest, in uncounted numbers, for countless ages, have given their dust to earth again, the mother of us all. Gone — but, even in a certain physical or material sense, *not lost;* the rather, to reappear again, always in higher and finer, never in lower and grosser form; in richer fruit and lovelier tinted flower to nourish human life and bless the human eye. Even this is a being raised to, or towards, honor, glory and immortal life, in a sense not to be lightly despised! And the writer has had moments not a few when *even this little,* as some may deem it, has seemed an inspiration able to lift his mind to a higher level; has seemed at least a fact of Nature made a fact of consciousness, and no fine spun chimera depending upon historical or philological considerations beyond his reach — satisfied, or, at least and lowest, satisfied to be satisfied if "only this and nothing more" be the Great Author's will!

Let us inquire further if this be all. Always, prophets and poets have told and sung of things which, if ever to be realized at all, were then and are yet *to be.* And some of their dreams,— to wisest men of the time wild almost to lunacy,— have come to be ordinary, scientific, commonplace, every-day, prosaic fact. Not to speak of telegraph and photograph, phonograph and spectroscope, consider telescope and microscope and what they have revealed, and have yet to disclose. Profound reflection suggests that, even in physical things, it will not do to take place with the scorners and scoffers; Nature seems too vast, too profound, to allow of that. If one to-day should say, "Behold, the days come when the sons and daughters of men, looking into a prepared box at the New York end, shall see the face of him who does the like at the Boston end of the circuit, and talk face to face by telephone as friend with friend," the writer would not dare ridicule either message or messenger, although the *how* of it be so inconceivable.

The "sacred books" of all the great religions are replete with poetic ideas. Shall we say that all of them are "all nothing," and reduce them to zero = zero? Possibly not. Take this: "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire,"— burned up,— utterly destroyed and dissipated into thin air, so that the fact of the one and the belief in the other are all forgotten among men as of no further utility or significance. "No death"! Is immortality a fact, or ever to become such? But one may say that the above refers to another world, and not to immortality on this

earth, nor under these skies and stars. *Is this true?* Here on this planet is the home of man till he can cross the airless deserts of space and cultivate other stars and suns and nebulæ. "While yet man knows comparatively nothing even of the material universe over which he ruminates and roams, must even his very religion teach him that death shall forever devour him as loathsome vermin do the dogs?" Believe it not! For under these stars and skies, and upon this present earth, immortality must be evolved. Humanity can only be elevated by the lifting up of the individuals who compose it.

Consider for a moment the "freaks" of life — young Safford, to whom the highest mathematics were as the multiplication-table to you and me; "Blind Tom," with his genius for music; sleep-walkers, climbing dizzy heights; "fasters," and a host of other "freaks" setting all known laws of normal life at defiance. Suppose the *ab*normal should some day become normal, and dreamy night blaze into day? Let there be born a person as great in each of only thirty directions as "Blind Tom" in one; would not the vulgar regard him as a god? Every one of these phenomena was produced by some *law*, and one day these laws, with many more, will be stamped on the human heart, for the "Comandments" are in no wise limited to ten. Possibly it is well the world does not know them all yet, for it is a fearful thing to have the truth and not to *live* it. The elements below have to be worked over and over yet. Nature makes not the mistake of creating a race of mere animals till the earthly conditions for their subsistance are complete. These "freaks" lift the veil for a moment, and we catch a glimpse of what one day must be. For Nature's great chronometer never runs down; men die, and the ideas they have created and called Gods die with them, but with her a day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day. Every step upward is the result of toil and thought; above all, of *suffering.* Every new thought hinges in some mysterious way upon all that has gone before; but even a woman forgets her suffering "for joy that a man is born into the world."

We are here brought directly to the main point of this paper. At present, as in all the past, and perhaps for very long periods to come, Nature's only method of creating "souls" is by the sexual union of male and female. *It is, then, to physical generation, rather than to "regeneration," that the advanced thought of Humanity must turn.* Indeed, there is no capacity for regeneration save through favoring conditions in the physical, the material. No woman at all illumined needs to be told this, and to the writer it is as clear as ever was the sun in the heavens. And for the end in

view there are certain laws and conditions,— *inflexible* and *inexorable*, the writer was almost betrayed into saying; but just here, of necessity, thought turns to poetry and admiration verges towards adoration! O man, worship here! For these laws seem to defy analogies from the lower, the animal world, and to have a certain swing, or elasticity, perhaps within narrow, perhaps wider limits. Woman can incarnate her ideal; and human destiny itself, in a large degree, seems thus to be committed to human keeping! How else is it that the child of a drunkard, conceived and born under conditions which make the wisest fear that the little-one may inherit a depraved appetite, turns out precisely the reverse, and develops into a temperance reformer?

Here, as nowhere else in the whole range of thought, the idea of striving for the true, the beautiful and the holy, from motives of gratitude to the Author who has made man so magnificent, finds complete justification and a hearty response. That a woman should do her best creative work it must be done in Love. First, last, and all the time,— the *sine qua non*,— this is the law: Love of the work she is doing; love of the new being.

Man may worship, must wonder and worship contantly, but his only really practical duties lie all in the direction of Humanity. The Great Author needs no praises sung nor sacrifices burned. "There is but one temple in the world, and that is the body of man," says Novalis. Even Nature, elsewhere so stern, seems to soften in presence of the Holy of Holies in the inner temple. Verily the ethics of human generation are quite other than the ethics of the pens and stalls.

It is for the elevation of woman we must labor, if we hope for the race. While I am obliged to doubt of immortality as a property or even a capacity of the human atom in all the past, the present, and perhaps for an almost inconceivable period yet to come, I am forced to conclude that such a condition must at length be. Could every child-bearing woman, in or out of the church, be profoundly impressed with the scientific fact that her creative work is the holiest of all work, as it surely is, to be undertaken only in love and with devout thankfulness even as expressed Luke i., 46–56,—"My soul doth magnify the Lord," etc.,—I should feel that immortality, or something nearly akin thereto, was not so many, many weary ages off. It is because the feeling is so often far different from this; it is because so little conscience in respect to these matters, in both men and women, has yet been developed, and because of hard material conditions, that we are not nearer to immortality to-day.

Love has been evolving ever since its hidden attraction

drew together the first primordial single cells in the bosom of the ocean. At least love exists; and it is almost unthinkable that it should have been, or could have been, evolved from an opposite or neutral principle, or from a blank. Anterior to suns and stars I have to postulate the immortal principle of love, cause and source of all life, enveloping all the past and ruling the present, and to last, unfold and shine when suns and stars shall have been blown out like lamps. That immortal principle I worship; in that we are suffused; in that we live and die. But I am obliged to admit that to me its clearest expression, that which touches me more nearly and moves me more profoundly than all historical or theological facts or fictions, is the present living fact of plain human love; Mother-love, and the loves that cluster about it.

"What is here but ancient sex-worship, elevated by modern thought?" some, reading this article, will say. "Exalting the creature above the Creator," others will cry. Well, be it so. This, at any rate, in substance, if not in form, is about all the "religion" I have capacity for at present. For me, at least, it is of no use to pitch the tune higher than I can carry it through.

I would bring all customs, institutions, all proposed reforms, and the whole conduct of life, to this simple practical, common-sense test: How will it affect woman's conditions? In protecting her as the part of Humanity most needing protection; in every way elevating and improving her condition, that she may the better fulfil her creative work as "Mother and Maker" of man; in aiding to inspire within her noble and beautiful ideals, that her work of incarnation may be in freedom and in mental serenity,— in these things lie the faith and hope, and rule of conduct, of the future. And as the future shall realize, practically, these principles, so shall the Kingdom of God come on this tired earth and human capacity for immortal life be perfected.

To this end,— inasmuch as it is a movement immediately touching, nay, vitally involving, the condition and welfare of woman,— lies my interest in modern economic reform. The want and pain of the world bear so heavily on her who is in many respects least able to bear it, that the very stones of the street cry out to you and me to dry up the sources from which the want and pain come.

Hoary institutions, vested rights, are against us as human beings; — our fight is against customs, not against men. And our weapons are spiritual only. Love, the oldest of all principles, must be our only weapon,— all powerful, like volcanic fire; melting down the hardest rocks of opposition, yet never throwing mud or dead theoretical cinders,—

withering in its course the mushroom of a night and sweeping away the oak of a thousand years, — bearing away all obstacles in a steady transcendent glow. In love our work: and Love shall conquer.

A. P. Brown.

OUGHT.

From out the purple reaches of the night,
Projected from the rearmost æon's roll,
A Word sent thunders through my startled soul.
'Twas moulten in the fires that set alight
The primal suns; within it throbbed the might
Of all the gods and dæmons who control
The worlds and ages groping to their goal,
And Knowledge there declared of wrong and right.

Love, yearning through the thunder and the fire,
Looked luringly adown the Universe,
And Justice held a bleeding heart's desire
In dry, ungentle eyes, what time the curse
Of angry Law, with poise infallible,
From out his grasp in chastening missiles fell.

C. A. Lane.

THE RISE OF MEDICINE.

How primitive man treated disease and eased pain is now mainly a matter of pure conjecture. General inferences may be drawn from the methods of modern savages and the traditions carried into historic time. Till men suffered by the mere sight of suffering in others, no effort was likely to be put forth to still the pain felt by a neighbor, or stay the ravages of disease upon him. Side by side with the development of the altruistic fellow-feeling has gone on the Evolution of Medicine.

There looms up with the dawn of history an indefinite mass of distorted facts and pure fiction from which modern Physical Science as well as modern Medical Science has been born. To fully realize the process by which the change went on is exceedingly difficult, owing to our inability to put ourselves, in fancy, into the queer mental states of our progenitors. It is hard for us to believe that they were as thoroughly steeped in superstition as the facts force us to acknowledge. Supernaturalism wove itself into every thought and controlled every act. The ghost-theory explained every fact of their experience. Winds and waves, falling bodies, light and darkness, disease and death, were all the direct results of the wills of ghosts. Our modern

savages are in this same frame of mind, and show neither surprise nor wonder at anything that occurs. To them, our telephones and telegraphs, railway-trains, and machinery of all kinds, are as simple and understandable as is the shooting of an arrow from their bow. Their belief in magic by ghost-power is thorough, unwavering and radical. It no more occurs to them to question this than it does to us to question that twice two is equal to four. Their only cause of wonder is the occasional failure of civilized man to do some miraculous thing they think he should be able to do by his magic.

This way of thinking keeps savages, and kept primitive man, in incessant and abject terror of the forces of Nature, and made them the dupes of every miracle-monger that came along. The dangerous, and to them evil, forces were the objects of their worship. They did not consider it good policy to worship a good god, as he would be good to them anyway. The evil powers were therefore the ones propitiated at first. When a person became sick, it was taken at once to be a case of obsession. One or more evil spirits were supposed to have taken possession of him. How to drive the bad ghosts out was the problem they set before themselves to solve.* Of course they had to resort to the priests for help in all such cases. Thus it is, that the earliest historical records tell only of ecclesiastical physicians, and their treatment consisted solely of charms, prayers or incantations, coupled of course with some rich offering to the gods.† With the differentiations of theology came corresponding changes in the theory of disease and its treatment. When one good God, and a devil with a host of minor evil spirits, came to be believed in, the notion arose that sickness was due to sin.‡ It was considered that God was meting out justice to the sick. Then repentance was preached as a saving grace, and prayer as the talisman to recovery. Written prayers were fastened around the diseased part, and the sign of the cross or other religious sign drawn over the same as a charm. By thus pleasing God, they were supposed to be removing themselves from the buffetings of Satan. When they failed to rally after this, they were thought to be very wicked indeed, and as God continued to curse them it was impious for man to be kind to them.

Under idolatry and fetishism, remedies of a simple character were resorted to. Under Christianity and the strict sects of the Hebrews, the resort to therapeutic measures was considered a lack of faith in God. The fetish-worshiper began his use of remedies as a logical sequence of

*Lubbock's Origin of Civilization, p. 19.
†American Cyclopædia, word "Medicine."
‡Job, chap. 2, v. 7, chap. 15, v. 20; John, chap. 9, v. 2.

his faith. The Hebrew and Christian rejected them on the same ground.* The former believed that there were souls to all objects, dead as well as living. Some souls were bad and some good. Bad souls made disease, and good ones health. They held that what was eaten imparted its soul, in whole or in part, to the eater. Cowards ate the lion's flesh to gain bravery, and his bones for strength. Weak stomachs were supposed to be cured by eating strong ones. People with short breath expected improvement from eating foxes, that were believed to have long breath. Only women were allowed to eat deer-flesh, as it made them faint-hearted. New-Zealanders make baptised children swallow pebbles, to make them hard-hearted and incapable of pity.†

The only speck of sunshine for progressive Medicine, over a period of thousands of years, was when the Ptolemies founded and cared for the Alexandrian library, allowing human dissections, and encouraging the importation of all sorts of remedies from every part of the earth. Then arose a large number of able anatomists and physicians, who added extensively to human knowledge and redeemed the Art of Medicine from the region of downright superstition.‡ But while Egypt was thus basking in the light of Science, Rome was depending upon charms and incantations to heal her sick. At every epidemic they built a temple to pacify the supposed angry gods. Soon, however, they borrowed from their more fortunate neighbors much of their skill and knowledge. Celsus has shown us that this was really no beggarly amount. They were able to perform operations for hernia, calculus, intestinal wounds, and cataract. They could use the catheter, trephine, ligature severed arteries, and remove hemorrhoids. They used lead plaster for the same purposes as we do to-day, and employed opium as successfully in curing dysentery. About this time, too, some cathartics had been discovered. A generation later, Galen compiled the medical knowledge of the times, after which an era of darkness set in, when men's minds were frozen into set forms for twelve hundred years. Christianity, such as it then was, soon became a power in the land, and it was the sworn foe to medical progress. It was willing enough, usually, to accept acquired facts, but no new ones were allowed to be promulgated, nor efforts made to discover them. As the Bible was the only guide in matters theological, so Galen became the sole authority in matters medical. To dare to differ from Galen was to raise a similar tempest to daring to differ from Christ. Dissecting human bodies, under Paganism, was a misdemeanor; under Christianity it became the most horrible

* James, chap. 5, v. 14, 15.
† Lubbock's Origin of Civilization, p. 13.
‡ Peters' Pictorial History of Ancient Pharmacy, p. 18.

of crimes. From time to time the church would rise up in arms against medical men because of some new discovery. Then all medicine would for a season be denounced. The doctors were charged with sorcery and unlawful compact with the devil, crimes punishable by burning at the stake.* In 1243, the Dominicans solemnly interdicted every member of their order from the study of medicine. About the same time, the popes ordered all medical books from the monasteries, and forbade their study. Petrarch called the doctors, "Men who deny Genesis and bark at Christ."† They were called Atheists, Mohammedans, Sorcerers, Magicians, and all other titles likely to embitter the ignorant and superstitious against them. As late as 1722, the Rev. Edward Massey said that diseases are sent by Providence for the punishment of sin, and the attempt to prevent them is a "diabolical operation."

During all this dark period the only valuable gains made were borrowed from the Mohammedans. Avicenna, an Arabian, taught us how to use colchicum for gout, iron for anæmia, and rhubarb in dysentery. To him we are indebted for cassia, senna, manna, tamarinds, and camphor. We here see why doctors were called "Mohammedans," a term that then was worse than burglar or thief is to-day.

In the 15th century, a number of bold spirits defied the popular prejudice so far as to dissect bodies privately. Some were caught and severely punished. In the 16th century, more of it still was done, in defiance of law, but privately, of course. Strange to say, however, even these men could not divorce themselves from subserviency to Galen. Whatever they found disagreeing with his description was set down as due to human degeneracy. The body not being just as Galen described it, it must have changed. Galen could not be mistaken.‡ It is ever thus, in progress from superstition to truth. The majority take the popular side, whether right or wrong. Nor can they be blamed for this. As a rule it is the side of the greatest safety. Dissentients, in defending a solitary fragment of truth, are more likely than not to discard the accumulated experiences of the race, making that fragment do duty for the whole. The men and women that are able honestly to weigh facts, and be guided solely thereby, are, in every age, few and far between. Hence it is, as a rule, safer to err on the side of conservatism than on that of so-called radicalism. In spite of this, we cannot help wishing that there had been more, and more pronounced, radicals during the Middle Ages.

The theological nightmare of those times, especially in Christian countries, is somewhat appalling. Medical Sci-

* White's Warfare of Science, p. 77.
† Ibid, pp. 100 to 108.
‡ American Cyclopædia, word "Medicine."

ence was held by it as in an iron vice. Escape was impossible. To be brought face to face with the crass ignorance, and horrible medical superstitions, then indulged in, is—well, frankly, it is nauseating, and very apt to seriously disturb delicate stomachs. Nor need we go back much over a century to find it, since the awakening is of very recent occurrence. For instance, take "Helmont's Amulet for the Plague," which sober, sensible—yes, sensible, as sensibility went in those days—medical men of good standing endorsed, declaring that it had "proven its efficacy in many instances" (I am quoting their own words), "particularly during the war between the Imperialists and Regulars in Hungary, where the plague raged in a terrible manner. It gained such a reputation throughout the country that all barbers and blear-eyed witches are already acquainted with its virtues."* The recipe was so highly esteemed among the leading medical men of the times that it occupied a prominent place in a Pharmacopœia of 1731, and was endorsed by the College of Physicians of the Kingdom of Prussia. Here is the delectable recipe: "Large, old frogs, caught in the month of June, are hung up by their hind legs over a dish covered with wax, which has been placed over a moderate fire. After a few days, the frogs discharge horrible fumes and slaver, which attract every kind of worms and flies. These stick to the wax and add their own drivel to the mess. When the frogs are dead, roast and mix them with the carefully preserved mixture of wax and drivel, and shape this compound into small rolls, or imitate the shapes of frogs. One of these is sewn into a cloth, and worn in the region of the heart, suspended by a silk thread around the neck. The longer one wears these, the more certainly will he be protected from the ravages of the plague."†

In 1663, Bechler's "Parnassus Medicinalis Illustratus" contained, among other equally quaint yet loathsome therapeutics, the following: "Powdered human bone in red wine will cure dysentery. The marrow and oil distilled from bone is good for rheumatism. Prepared human skull is a sure cure for the falling sickness. Moss grown on a skull is a hæmostatic. Mummy dissolves coagulated blood, relieves cough, etc. . . . Human fat, when properly rubbed into the skin, restores weak limbs. Water distilled from human hair, and mixed with honey, promotes the growth of hair," etc. The druggists at this time kept in stock, for the compounding of physicians' prescriptions, the excreta of human beings and animals, spirit of human skull, spirit of human bones, human fat, "poor sinner's fat," wolf-liver,

* New England Druggist, March, 1889, p. 12.
† Peters' Pictorial History of Ancient Pharmacy, pp. 128, 129; New England Druggist, March, 1889, pp. 12, 13.

fox-lung, deer-spine, pike's-jaw, rabbit-hair, gallstones, scorpion and centipede ashes,*

> "With more of horrible and awful,
> That even to name would be unlawful."

At the time these remedies were so popular, the Jesuit priests introduced from South America the bark of the Cinchona tree, for the cure of malarial diseases. Protestant Europe rose up in arms against it, and stigmatized it as "Jesuit Bark." Blood-curdling stories of its poisonous and destructive effects were told, and these, in modified form, have been handed down from sire to son until the present day. Scarcely a month ago, a patient of mine refused to take quinine, because it was the poisonous extract of Jesuit bark. Ever since charms and prayers were replaced by therapeutic measures, men have striven to discover specifics for diseases. The majority of laymen to-day think that doctors have such specifics. In "Jesuit Bark" and its alkaloid, quinine, we have about the nearest approach ever reached to such a thing as a specific in medicine, and yet theological bigotry in disguised form causes hundreds of sufferers to refuse to use it. Doctors are compelled, in such cases, to hide the name under some foreign synonym, so that their patients shall not know that they are swallowing, in not only harmless but really useful doses, this drug. Our fathers condemned it, and lied about it, merely because Catholic Priests first brought it to notice; but they did not hesitate to swallow their own and other human beings' and animals' filth, or decoctions from skulls gathered from graveyards. Cinchona, in spite of theological ire, has proven itself fit, and survived; the other remedies were unfit, and only persist in modified forms and obscure places because superstition is not yet dead in the earth.

ROBT. G. ECCLES.

* Ibid.

PRAYER.

WITH the fine verses of Montgomery all are familiar:

> Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
> Uttered or unexpressed;
> The motion of a hidden fire
> That trembles in the breast.

In the evolution of the idea of prayer there seem to be three distinct stages — and possibly we may include four.

(1st) If prayer be a beseeching of the gods, accompanied by sacrifice, as it was originally, to avert some impending danger, real or imagined, then plainly prayer is

irrational as a practice for Liberals. If prayer be an importuning of God to be more merciful than he is, and not damn so many of his children, but to "save souls from the eternal burnings," then evidently Liberals have no use for it; for all of them who believe in God believe that he is goodness itself, and that he cannot be more merciful than he already is.

(2d) If prayer be a request that the All-wise should change some existing purpose of his,—as, for instance, to save the life of a ruler whom, from existing causes, he had intended to permit death to overcome; or if it be a request that he should form some new purpose, such as to send rain, or to give a bountiful harvest, or even to give "his spirit," or to give victory to an army whose chaplains are praying for it while the chaplains of an opposing army are as fervently praying against it,—that were asking for omnipotence to place itself at the disposal of finite, and, consequently, ignorant men: a most dangerous thing to do.

(3d) If prayer be, as it is in the third stage of the unfolding of its idea, not a request; not a begging of God; not a directing of him in any way, but simply "praise,"—it cannot be good except on the supposition that God loves to be praised. Praise is certainly very comely for those who need it, if by it they are helped. Wives need the praise of their husbands, because of their frequent weakness to bear the burdens and perform the arduous duties of mothers and home-makers. Children often need praise, to encourage them in the pursuit of their studies or other tasks. Public speakers may need the praise of their audiences, in the form of applause, to help them on (political speakers evidently do);—but all because of weakness. One of the first indications of the approach of the infirmities of age is, not infrequently, a manifest love for the praise of existing excellencies or of past deeds. In all of this I speak of praise addressed to the face. All great egotists delight to be so praised. Can it be presumed that God loves to be told by men that he is almighty, that "he is a great God," or that he is a very good person?

(4th) But there is the possible fourth stage. If prayer consists in entering into the thought and sympathy and helpfulness of Eternal Goodness,—in behalf of the orphan that cries, for the widow who mourns, for the mother whose tears fall into the empty cradle, for the poor who have no bread, for the houseless and homeless, for the sick and the dying, then prayer is comely. Moreover, if prayer be crystallized into *deeds of love*, so that it give employment to the destitute; so that it watch days and nights with the sick; so that it give knowledge to the ignorant, strength for weakness, purity for impurity, love for enmity,—then again prayer is comely.

If words are to be used, perhaps the advice and example of Jesus are not so far from the best as some have supposed; namely, that men should not pray in public, but in the secrecy of the thought and heart alone; and that they should not pray with many words. With this thought, the following further lines from Montgomery seem to be in accord:

"Prayer is the burden of a sigh,
The falling of a tear,
The upward glancing of an eye
When none but God is near.

"Prayer is the contrite sinner's voice,
Returning from his ways,
While angels in their songs rejoice,
And cry, Behold, he prays!"

The *deed* is the prayer.

PERRY MARSHALL.

THE STATE AND THE SCHOOL.

To THE educator, the statesman, and the philanthropist, no question can be of greater theoretical interest, or of more practical importance, than that of the relation of these two great human institutions, the State and the School.

The determination of the relations and value of all social institutions depends upon an understanding of man's nature and destiny; for all of these institutions are set up by man for the purpose of securing the development of those various powers and activities which constitute his nature, and of facilitating the free and harmonious action of those powers which must, so far as we can see, lead on to his destiny. The State, the School, the Church, and the Family, are each and all human institutions; things set up by man for purposes and ends of his own, and have each and all been subject to modification to suit the growing needs of a continually changing and gradually progressive being.

There are those who say that the State, the Family, and the Church, are divine institutions; but it seems to be an improper and confusing use of language to so term them. Of course to those who believe in a supreme personal first cause of all things, all human institutions may be said to be of divine origin, in the sense of that supreme cause being the ultimate origin of all that comes to pass by virtue of the action of those laws through which he operates in the creation and maintenance of the world; but in this sense everything that man does may be

said to be of divine origin, and such a use of the term would mark no distinction, and would therefore be useless. But if it is claimed that any State, Family, or Church is of divine origin in the sense of the supreme first cause having specifically set up and hallowed with any peculiar sanctity any one of these institutions, we must demur, and ask those who make such a claim to point out one family, among all the families of the earth, one State or nation, among all the various peoples, or one church, among the thousands of sects and denominations of the world, the origin of which cannot be distinctly traced to the conscious concurrence, express or implied, of the individuals composing any of such organizations. The essential elements of character, which make each and all of these institutions necessary to his complete unfolding, are given to man with his very being, and are certainly of divine origin, but the organization and form of these institutions are as purely human, and as much the result of voluntary human action, as is the building of a ship or the organization of the postal-service. Man does not create society; he is born into those essential relations with his race which constitute the social organism, but he does create and establish all those social institutions which serve as external manifestations of his conceptions of the rights and duties growing out of these necessary relations with his fellow-men.

What, then, are those essential elements that constitute man's nature, and how shall he attain their complete development, which must be his destiny?

We define matter as that which has the three dimensions of extension,—length, breadth, and thickness. So we may define spirit as that which has the three intensions of being, sensibility, intelligence, and will; or, to use more general terms, feeling, thought and freedom. In man, both matter and spirit are combined in essential unity. We know nothing of spirit save as manifested and differentiated in and through matter; and we know nothing of matter save as illuminated, interpreted and unitized by spirit. We study the world of Nature, or Matter, for the purpose of learning the law, meaning or spirit of its operations, and of understanding the relation of the spirit that animates and controls it to that rational spiritual essence we call ourselves. As points, lines or surfaces are purely abstract, or imaginary, save as united together in solidity; so feeling, thought and freedom are purely abstract or imaginary elements, save as united together in spirit. In matter, the the three elements of length, breath and thickness may be combined in the particular forms of matter in every degree of each dimension, but the perfect or ideal form of matter is the sphere, in which they are all present in an equal

degree. So in the spiritual world each of its elements may appear in the individual person, in every variety of inequality, but the perfect or ideal form of spirit is that in which feeling, thought and freedom are each equally manifest, in the perfectly rounded whole of sentient, rational freedom. If these are the essential elements of man's nature, then the problem of his destiny must be the perfect and harmonious development of this nature, under those conditions of reciprocal relationship to all other beings of like nature with himself, who make up the social system into which he is born.

This perfect and harmonious development of the individual member of the social organism is only to be attained through the co-operation and concurrent development of the social organism itself; for the individual unit and the organic whole of which it forms a part mutually condition each other. Primitive man, prompted by instinct as well as by the first dawnings of his rational spirit, sought and rendered that co-operation with his fellows necessary to the preservation of his existence and welfare, as first obscurely discerned and understood; and at once set up, in its primitive form, the State, which as the mother and protector of all other institutions contained within itself the seeds of them all, and in some degree blindly performed the functions of all. The end and aim of primitive man in organizing the State was the same that has animated and governed all men since that time, in setting up every social institution; namely, to secure by co-operation with his fellows the necessary conditions for his existence and welfare. At first he may have thought that the protection of his person and property from the aggression of other tribes or people was the only thing necessary for his well-being, and he organized the State with powers adequate to that end; but he soon discovered that he must also have some protection to life, limb and property from those within his own tribe, and the powers of the State were enlarged and extended to meet this new want. It would be interesting to trace the growth of the knowledge of his own nature, and of his conception of the necessary conditions of the existence and welfare of that nature, as exhibited in the history of the laws and institutions which man has from time to time set up to secure those conditions; but it is sufficient for our present purpose to indicate the fact that such history shows that as man has successively arrived at higher stages of development, he has ever broadened the scope and functions of the co-operative powers of the State, so as to make them commensurate with those wants of his nature, to the knowledge of which that stage of culture had brought him.

We may define the State as that corporate body, established by the common consent, express or implied, of a number of persons living contiguous to each other, with the power and authority to make and enforce, in the name of all, laws or rules for the maintenance of those necessary conditions of the being and welfare of all. And every such State or law-making power, whether vested in one man, a few men, or a representative body elected by a greater or less number of the whole people, we find always taking as a part of its function and duty the education at public expense of those who are, by the constitution of such State, to be entrusted with the powers and responsibilities of the government. Under a monarchy, such education extended to the household of the sovereign; under an aristocracy it embraced the ruling classes; and it has only been since the stage of representative government has been reached that we have as a fixed policy extended public education to the great mass of the people. This seems to have been the historical evolution of the public school, based upon the recognized duty of those who for the time being exercised the governmental functions of the State to provide for a continuation of those functions and the life of the State, by the education and training at public expense of those designed by the constitution to succeed to these important trusts.

While this generally accepted principle of self-preservation on the part of the State is perfectly valid, and is broad enough to secure the public education of every citizen entrusted with the elective franchise, and will ultimately secure the education of all when the franchise shall be put on its true ground of the right of every rational being to a voice in determining its relations to its fellow beings; yet it is not broad enough for the fundamental basis of the public education of the future, and we must go deeper than the training of the citizen for his public duties. The formal argument for this historical theory is this: (1st) The social order is a necessary condition for the life and well-being of the individual. (2d) The institution of the State is a necessary means for the preservation of the social order. (3d) The education by the State of those to be entrusted with its functions is obvious, as a means of perpetuating the State. But when we look at the matter from the standpoint of the organic solidarity of humanity, and see that not only is preservation of the social order a necessary condition of man's life and well-being, but that no individual can reach the highest measure of growth unless at the same time all other individuals that make up the social order into which he is born have also reached complete development, and that the individ-

ual social unit and the entire social organism mutually condition each other, then the personal end and aim of the individual, for the complete development of his own spiritual nature, is seen to perfectly harmonize with the public and impersonal aim, having for its object the same development of all other spiritual beings. The purest egoism thus becomes one with the highest altruism, and education, which is the name for all those consciously applied means for this complete development of his nature by elevating those elementary powers which make it up from their first form of blind, instinctive activities, determined by conditions outside of himself, to the high plane of conscious, rational, self-determined action, is at once recognized as the primary end for the attainment of which the State is organized, and the State is relegated to its rightful place as a necessary means to this primary end.

Rights and duties appertain only to rational, spiritual beings, and are based solely on the possession of such a nature. As a rational being I am bound to co-operate with all other men, for the attainment of every rational end; and as such I have also a right to demand their co-operation toward every such end. This duty, and this right, constitute the fundamental basis of the State. I have as much right to demand the co-operation of my fellow-men, through the organism of the State, for maintaining the conditions of my full development, as for maintaining the conditions of existence itself; the right of existence implies the right to complete existence. The duty of every rational being to develop to the highest degree his own spiritual nature, he owes to himself simply because of that spiritual nature; and he owes to every other rational being the duty of giving him an equal opportunity, for the like full development of his spiritual nature. How is this right to be invoked, and this duty discharged, so well as through the potent arm of the State, that mighty institution set up by the consent of all, to speak in the name of all, and to act with the power of all? As a rational being I am bound to furnish my children every opportunity and assistance in my power for their complete spiritual development; and the basis of this obligation is not because they are my children, but because they are rational beings. And I am under the same obligations to the children of every other man. How shall this duty of every man to every child be discharged, save through that highest and most efficient co-operative agent, the State? The State is thus seen to be the proper and only adequate and efficient organism for discharging those duties which each man owes to every other in society; and the principle of the division of labor and the specialization of functions, which accompanies all higher development

of organism, has led to the formation, in every civilized State of to-day, of a department of public instruction, charged with the administration of this great public duty.

The wonderful growth of Corporations, Trusts, Unions, and Brotherhoods, in modern times, is silently but surely teaching the great mass of men the immense power of co-operative effort in working out both industrial and social problems, while the improved moral culture of the people is rapidly making them favorable to the ushering in of those conditions which shall permit the application of the principle of the co-operation of all citizens, through the organism of the State, in promoting all the recognized ends of man's rational nature. But a profounder study of the relations between the individual and the race, which are coming to be treated of under the general name of Sociology, brings to our minds, with the force of almost absolute demonstration, the fact that no individual can be fully free, while any other individual is enslaved or oppressed; for the knowledge that there are those in the State who will oppress others, requires each man to devote some part of his time to taking due precautions against such oppressor, that he would gladly devote to other and higher ends. Nor can any man enjoy the full measure of his industry, so long as any other man fails to render a just equivalent in labor for what he consumes; and it makes no difference whether he who fails is honest, and fails for want of opportunity to work, or whether he is dishonest, and refuses to work simply because he is lazy, or because the laws of inheritance, or some other accident, have seemingly placed him beyond the necessity for work. Everything consumed by these parasites must be produced by the honest labor of the other members of society, who are thus robbed of a part of the results of their industry. No man gets the full benefit of his intellectual culture until every other man is equally studious and cultured; for he must devote a great part of his time to avoiding or correcting the results of the ignorance or folly of others, instead of giving it all to the still further advancement of himself. No man can reach the highest spiritual development until he finds in every other member of society a generous sympathy with his noblest sentiment, a clear reflection and appreciation of his deepest thought, and a hearty co-operation with his highest endeavor.

This view then of education by the State, based not on the grounds of State necessity, nor on the economic ground of State co-operation being the cheapest and the best means to effect a desired end, but upon that last discovered but deepest and most fundamental spiritual principle of the organic solidarity of humanity and essential unity of all rational existence, must be the standpoint from which we de-

fend that thorough system of public education of the future that shall afford the means, during the most plastic period of his life, for the development of every man's sensibilities, until he shall take cognizance of every attribute of matter and of spirit manifest in the universe; means for the development, also, of his intellectual powers, until he shall grasp in a complete system of laws all of the objects of feeling and perception; and means for the development of his powers of active will, until he shall, in his freedom, self-determine his every action in accordance with the ends of all rational beings.

The State may be regarded as the external manifestation of the moral character and sentiments of a majority of the individual units that compose it; and as this sense of the obligation of every man to every other rational being, whether child or adult, comes to be more fully recognized, acknowledged, and organized into the laws and institutions of the State, this educational function of the State will become more and more important and receive a larger measure of attention and a greater share of the public revenue.

As a citizen of the State each man has as much personal interest in the higher education of the College and the University as he has in the education of the Common Schools; in the full development of every citizen as in that citizen's partial development; for this highly complex civilization of modern times demands for its maintenance and advancement the highest skill and culture which the best of training can give. As a member of the State viewed as a co-operative agency for the most economic maintenance of those conditions which are necessary to man's physical and spiritual life and welfare, each man is as much concerned for the complete mastery by every individual man of the laws of Nature and his own being, which constitute the wealth and power of the State, as he has in the complete mastery of the same by any particular man, or the partial mastery of such laws by all men. But, more than this, as an individual element of the great social organism of humanity, and as a fragment in the being of the eternal reason, man has the same spiritual interest in the full and complete development of every other man that he has *in his own;* for the full life and vigor of each element depends upon the full life and vigor of the organic whole, which is only consistent with the like condition of every one of the several elements that make it up. Here we find that each participates in the all, and that the all is the sum of each; and all other beings, whom we at first thought to be entirely distinct and different from, and often antagonistic to ourselves, are now recognized and known as only another and the larger, more potent and more enduring part of our-

selves. We have long since passed that stage of social development which Spencer calls the Militant type, in which men co-operate with each other on the basis of the subordination of the many to the one, or to the few, for the purpose of aggressive or defensive warfare between man and man, and have about reached the culmination of the Industrial type, in which men combine on the basis of equality and free competition for the purpose of subjugating to man's dominion the elements of Nature and the material world, and are ready for the next and highest stage, which may be called the Spiritual type of society, in which men will co-operate on the basis of fraternity and solidarity, for the purpose of subjugating the powers and passions of man's own nature to the dominion and control of universal reason as expressed in the Moral Law, and for bringing into complete unity and harmony the particular individual, the general organism of humanity, and that Universal Reason which is in all, and through all, and over all.

The most powerful agent in the inauguration of this highest type of civilization is our public school system, and upon the faithfulness and efficiency of those now engaged in the work of education depends, in a great degree, the rapidity with which this great revolution shall be consummated. It well becomes every teacher, therefore, to magnify the worth and dignity of his office, by demanding, as a man and as a citizen, the recognition of the true, rational basis on which our public school system rests, as well as by a more thorough mastery of the laws of Nature, and of man's spiritual being, in order to perfect and extend that system so as to afford to every child of the State an opportunity for the normal and complete development of his rational nature; and, above all, by a more thorough self-culture and self-control, to offer to every such child the stimulus of a noble example, which is the greatest, if not the only real service which one free being can render to another.

TEMPLE BEAUFORD.

INQUIRY CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION.

[Translated from pp. 61–75 of "*Hypnotisme et les Religions:* by Skepto." Pp. 294. Paris: Octave Doin, 1888.]

D.—WHAT clothing did Jesus Christ wear immediately after his resurrection?

R.—He was dressed as a gardener. For, when he appeared to Mary Magdalene, after his return to life, she did not recognize him, but took him for the gardener.

D.—Was it not before raising her eyes to Jesus that Magdalen was thus deceived?

R.—Not at all. St. John says expressly (xx., 14, 15), She turned and saw Jesus standing, and did not recognize him. And Jesus said to her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, said to him, Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will go to seek him.

It is then evident that it was while seeing Jesus that Magdalen took him for the gardener.

D.—Why was Jesus dressed as a gardener?

R.—Because his clothing had been distributed among the soldiers by lot. When he returned to life, they gave him the first garments they could find. They borrowed those of the gardener of Joseph of Arimathea, on whose property was the tomb in which Jesus had been laid.

D.—Was there then some one near Jesus when he returned to life?

R.—Evidently. It is written in the Gospel that Joseph of Arimathea, a distinguished person, demanded his body to bury it, and that he carried it to one of his estates where was a tomb cut in the rock. There they washed his body and rubbed it with aromatic essences, according to the custom of the Jews. This was what brought him back to life. John's Gospel says that Nicodemus brought a hundred pounds of aloes and myrrh (xix., 39).

D.—You forget that there were soldiers to guard the tomb.

R.—A single evangelist, Matthew, speaks of soldiers. But, according to him, the soldiers were sent only Saturday morning. Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus had, then, all Friday night, until Saturday, to take care of Jesus. Here are the words of Matthew (xxvii., 62 to 66): "Now on the morrow, which is the day after the Preparation, the chief priests and the Pharisees were gathered together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest haply his disciples come and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: and the last error will be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a guard; go your way, make it as sure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them."

D.—I believe there was, from the beginning, a great crowd of people to guard the tomb.

R.—Had it been so, the evangelists would not have failed to report a detail so important. But the proof that the tomb was not guarded from Friday to Saturday is that on Saturday the priests went to find Pilate to get permission

to guard the tomb, saying that otherwise the body would be carried off. Moreover, three evangelists say nothing of a guard. The body of Jesus had been given to his friends, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, both rich and powerful. They had taken it to a private estate, where no one had a right to interfere with them. Even had they been watched, nothing would have appeared strange in the washing of the body, the fumigations, and the aromatic frictions, since these were part of the funeral observances among the Jews.

D.—The evangelists declare that Jesus died on the cross.

R.—The evangelists have told what they believed true. But their narrative itself shows that they believed without serious investigation; without any scientific proof. They have gone purely and simply by appearances, without even suspecting that what they took for death might be only a state of lethargy or catalepsy, resulting from the pain and the nervous tension produced by suspension on the cross.

According to the Gospel, Jesus expired after three or four hours of suffering. But this time was ordinarily insufficient for the death of a crucified person. Thus, when the body was demanded of Pilate, he could not at first believe that Jesus was already dead. It needed the affirmation of the centurion to persuade him. But the centurion was not a physician, and was no more competent than the apostles to distinguish between real and apparent death. Even in our time physicians not unfrequently mistake.

If there were shown to you living, to-day, a man who had been thought dead yesterday or the day before, there are no possible medical investigations to which you would not have recourse to establish the fact that it was a real resurrection. The most irrefragable scientific proofs would be necessary to convince you. You would even have a right to suppose that the physicians themselves had been led astray by some circumstance beyond their knowledge, by some unexplained physiological phenomenon. In the Gospel-narrative the plainest guaranties of reasonable certainty are obviously wanting. The apostles are common people, ignorant and credulous, who have not thought of taking the most common precautions to avoid being the victims of appearances. Jesus himself could not possibly judge whether the insensibility from which he had been drawn in a manner so unexpected was really death, or simply lethargic or cataleptic swooning. It is known that awaking from a swoon seems a coming out from vacancy.

The spear-wound would have been fatal only if it had touched the heart. But nothing proves that the heart was pierced, and the evangelists do not affirm that it was. The blood and water escaping from the wound seem to prove,

on the contrary, that the pleura or the stomach only had been touched, and that life was not extinct, since the blood still flowed freely.

We must remember, besides, that except the priests and the Pharisees, Jesus had only sympathizing friends in Jerusalem. All the common people favored him, hoping that he would re-establish the kingdom of Israel. Even among the higher classes he had secret partisans. The Gospel says this expressly of Nicodemus, who brought the spices for his burial, and of Joseph of Arimathea, who claimed his body. As to the Romans, the Gospel says that Pilate, far from persecuting Jesus, made vain efforts to save him from the rancor of the priests and the rage of some underlings whom they had employed. The Roman soldiers had no cause for enmity to Jesus. At the request of Joseph of Arimathea, they refrained from breaking his legs. The spear-thrust was evidently given only as a needful precaution, and perhaps it was intentionally slight. At any rate, nothing proves that it was mortal. Everything shows, on the contrary, that it was not mortal, since Jesus, when taken down from the cross, returned to life.

D.—But Jesus returned to life only on the third day, and not on Friday, as you pretend.

R.—The Gospels do not say that Jesus was raised from the dead, but only that on the third day the tomb was empty. Jesus may, then, have revived either Friday evening or Saturday morning.

D.—Did not the disciples of Jesus know the details of his resurrection?

R.—Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus only knew the precise moment of the resurrection. But they avoided speaking of it, lest the enemies of Jesus should return to seize him. Jesus himself showed himself to his disciples only mysteriously, and remained but a few moments with them, by precaution against the priests and Pharisees.

D.—When Jesus appeared to his disciples, was he not transformed and divinized?

R.—Not at all. He was a man purely and simply, as before. The first time of his appearance was on the road to Emmaus. There were only two disciples, with whom he supped in a manner so natural that at first they did not recognize him. The same day he appeared to several others, who were troubled and frightened, thinking they had seen a spirit. But Jesus said to them, "Behold my hands and my feet! it is I. A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." The disciples remaining incredulous, Jesus said to them, "Have ye here anything to eat?" And they gave him broiled fish and honey-comb; and he ate of it before them, and having finished, gave them the remainder

(Luke xxiv., 37–44). The third time that he appeared to them was on the shore of the sea of Tiberias. It was on this occasion, according to St. John, that the miraculous draught of fishes was made, though it was placed before the Passion by another evangelist. Jesus then said to them, "Come and sup," and he supped with them (John xxi., 1–15).

Thus, every time that the risen Jesus returns to find his disciples, he eats with them; first, undoubtedly, because, having necessarily traveled on foot, he was really hungry; then, that he might dissipate their superstitious fear, and show them that he was not a ghost (since ghosts do not eat) but a man of flesh and bones, needing to eat and drink like themselves; in a word, the very Jesus whom they had known, wonderfully escaped from imminent death, and returned to mortal life.

Besides, Jesus showed himself to his disciples very rarely. Prudence forbade too much disclosure. The priests and the Pharisees would have seized him again.

Matthew and Luke speak of only two appearances after the resurrection, including the ascension. Mark and John mention only three. In the Acts of the Apostles it is said that he showed himself living to them during forty days, eating with them, but explaining nothing further, from which we may suppose that only the three or four appearances mentioned in the Gospels were intended. Had Jesus been a risen God, there would have been no need of being so sparing of his presence. He might have remained talking with his Apostles from morning till night, instead of appearing so rarely and having time to address to them only a few words.

The conduct, then, of the returned Jesus, is manifestly that of one who conceals himself from his enemies. He goes to find his disciples only furtively, and with very great precautions. He arranges to be preceded by devoted emissaries, for greater security. These emissaries were probably novices of the sect of Essenes, to which the doctrines of Jesus prove that he belonged. As they were clad in the white costume of their order, it has been since supposed that they were angels, from the notion that angels are necessarily dressed in white. But the Gospels say simply that they were young men. It was young men clad in white who announced the resurrection to the holy women and to the Apostles Peter and John. It was men clad in white who appeared to the assembled disciples when Jesus, decided to withdraw from the scene for some time, had bidden them farewell and disappeared in the fogs of the mountain. Later, this retreat so mysterious, remaining unexplained, transformed itself into a miraculous ascension.

It was not known then that what we call the sky is only space. It was not known that God, being a pure spirit, is everywhere at once and nowhere in particular. People thought, very simply, that above this blue sky there was some vast habitation, some immense palace, or some enchanted dwelling, the material residence of the Divinity and his court, like the residence of earthly kings. They thought it was necessary to mount in the air to reach this celestial place. They imagined, then, that the body of Jesus was suddenly released from the law of gravitation, and that it gradually rose in the air until a cloud happily came to conceal it, without which it would have been seen continuing to rise without ever attaining its destination, since space is infinitely extended. Later, they went still further in the same puerile way, and declared that Jesus, arrived at length at the end of his aërial journey, seated himself at the right hand of his Father on one of those thrones with which, at that period, it was thought suitable to furnish the palace of the King of heaven. It is still an article of faith of all the Christian churches that Jesus is seated at the right hand of the Father. "*Sedet ad dexteram Patris,*" says the Creed. They try, indeed, to explain this expression symbolically. But the first Christians did not understand it so. Since Jesus arose into the sky with a human body palpable and material like ours, he must necessarily have found a seat in the dwelling of his Father.

The ascension is reported only by Luke and Mark, who were not there, since they were converted to Christianity only some years after. John and Matthew, who were present at the leave-taking of Jesus, do not mention the ascension.

Only the men clad in white, those Essenian novices who served as messengers to Jesus, and who accompanied him in his retreat, knew the details of his real death, which undoubtedly occurred soon after his disappearance. But if, at last, they had wished to reveal that secret and pay homage to the truth, it was then too late. The legend was created. . . .

The evangelists sincerely believed in the resurrection of Jesus, but an attentive study of their writings shows that they believed without any serious investigation, without any scientific stand-point, without even suspecting that the death of Jesus might be only apparent, and that a temporary state of lethargy or catalepsy might have the appearance of actual death.

CHARLES K. WHIPPLE.

OUT OF THE DISTANCE.

A HAND from out of the distance reached,
And practised what I had often preached.

That hand — it was the hand of one
Who often fair deeds of good hath done,—
Though always with as unconscious grace
As violets in some greenwood place.

That distance — 'twere thousand miles if we ran —
But my heart can o'erleap it in moment's span!
The distance — ah me! But the soul knows not space:
I dream I am there, and I see face to face.

That "preaching"! Alas, garb of weakness it wore.
Yet, "Scatter fair blossoms!" — this tenor it bore.
And she — she oft truly the bidding well caught,
And ever doth practice what I had but *taught!*

Ah, blossoms, I bless thee! Thou givest me peace.
Thy fragrance deep hid in my heart shall not cease.
On wings ye me bear to loved river and dell,
And the Voice of the Eons thou speakest,—"'*Tis Well.*"

O hand that out of the distance reached,
To me and my soul *thou* hast more than "preached"!

JAMES H. WEST.

BOSTON, First Flower-Day, 1890.

BRAIN VERSUS BRAWN.

ONE of the great questions that is before our country to-day, and that every country has to meet, — one that involves millions of dollars and the principles, to some extent, on which is to turn the whole future of its civilization, and which in many respects is the most difficult that statesmanship has to deal with, — is what its people shall do in the way of arms and armor for their protection and defense. And it is a problem, too, that Nature, not less imperatively than nations, has had to deal with all through the past. War and the wager of battle, weapons and the wounds of conflict, are not the accident and disease of her original economy, not a human lapse and folly, but a constituent element in her very system of things. The moment she set her creatures on earth, even in their lowest forms, exposed to the elements and compelled to get their own living, most of them, by preying on each other, it became necessary, if their lives were not at once to be extinguished, to provide them with some means on the one hand of assault, and on the other of defense,— a necessity which is bound up inseparably with those two great principles on which all organic evolution is based, the struggle

for existence and the survival of the fittest. Devices to meet it have played a part in her economy second only to those for alimentation itself; are a field in which she, too, as much as any statesman, has had to tax all her resources and lay under tribute all her skill. The rocks below the earth's surface are a vast gallery in which, while the muscles, stomachs and brains of her children have perished, the arms and armor with which they fought have for ages been preserved, as in our museums above its surface are the swords, shields and coats-of-mail that our human ancestors, now dust, wore to battle in their brave days of old. And the result of these long experiments as to what are fittest, and have helped their users to be fittest also, is not only of itself one of the most beautiful chapters in the Book of Evolution, but one that pours a great flood of practical wisdom on the problems of our time as to the true principles to be followed in securing national, social and even religious survival and supremacy.

The first effort of her Vulcan fingers was in the line of protective armor pure and simple, the encasement of animals and plants in a mere hard outside covering. It is what the exposure alone of their original protoplasm to water, sun and air, aided by the secretion of mineral matter on the surface, and intensified by the survival and reproduction of the animals and plants which had it most, would tend naturally, in strict accordance with Darwin's laws, to produce; and it is now seen to advantage in the sea-urchin and star-fish among Radiates, in the oyster and clam among Mollusks, in the turtle and alligator among Vertebrates, in the eggs of birds, and, to some extent, in the skin and hair of all animals.

It was a form, however, to which Nature could not confine herself, especially in the animal kingdom. If live things were to live, either on each other or on vegetables, they obviously must have some means of breaking through each other's hard covers and getting at their inside meat. The means came to them in the form of cilia, tentacles, suckers, claws, mouths, horns, jaws, tails, tusks, teeth, beginning, perhaps, in such mere thread-like extensions of the inner protoplasm as are now seen in the rhizopods, and culminating in the apparatus of such magnificent vertebrate carnivora as the lion and the tiger.

But such weapons alone, with only the old protoplasmic bodies to wield them, would not have been enough; would indeed have been of less value to them than even their old outside covering. To have them of any real use Nature had to develop, along with them, bones, muscles, nerves, senses, brains, and, in some of their owners, the habit and power of association, — all that constitutes a highly organ-

ized internal structure. These were organs and faculties which became, in their turn, a new species of armor still more interior; became at any rate what had the same use as armor, — the quickness of eye that could discern the foe, the activity of limb that could fly to it, from it and around it, the shrewdness of mind that could observe its habits and select the best points for its attack, and the instinct of co-operation that could join forces in coping with it, differing only in their fineness from the sharpness of the tooth and the strength of the claw. And thus were introduced the two great principles that Nature has used in all her arming, and that have played and are still playing a most tremendous part in her economy, — their distinction being not exactly that of defensive and offensive weapons, for both, when need required, could be used defensively, but that the one had its chief value in its own outside strength, while the other depended for its efficacy on qualities connected with its possessor's inside development.

Equipped from her arsenal with the varied arms and armor which embodied, some of them one of these principles almost exclusively, and some a mingling of the two, Nature sent forth her myriad creatures into their great life-battle, world-wide in its field, where the issue has been not only which of themselves, but which of their weapons and of the principles on which their weapons were made, would prove the fittest, and best help their users to survive. During the long geologic ages they were all, and especially the outward kinds, enormously developed both in size and strength, and their underlying philosophy was tested in the severest way by contests alike with each other and with the world's equally ferocious natural elements. The Orthoceras, a huge cephaloid mollusk of the lower Silurian rocks, had a thick, hard, cylindrical covering, twelve to eighteen feet long and at its base a foot in diameter. The Dinichthys, a Devonian ganoid fish some thirty feet long, was protected about its head with a suit of massive articulated armor that a cannon-ball could hardly have crushed. Among the famous reptiles of the Jurassic and Cretaceous ages, — the Icthyosaur, Megalosaur, Mosasaur, Iguanodon and others, — some were fifty, sixty, and a hundred feet long, plated over with thick scales for defense, and armed for attack with claws hooked back like sickles, with long projecting tusks that shut down by each other like clasped fingers, and with sharp, glistening sabre-like teeth, sometimes four rows of them, and two hundred in number, — indeed "monstrous and prodigious things worse than fables yet have feigned." And the age of Mammals had its Mastodon with tusks twelve and fourteen feet long, its

Glyptodon with a solidified bony armor on its back nine feet across and weighing nearly four thousand pounds, its Megatherium with clawed feet a yard in length, and its Machairodus, a tiger whose open mouth was an arsenal set with natural swords.

How terrible must have been the contests of such monsters with each other, and the slaughter made by them on their weaker and less protected neighbors, — most truly "Nature red in tooth and claw with ravin"! How different the scenes of their world from the peace and repose that Miltonic poets have loved to picture as the condition of the earth "before the advent of man and sin"! The sea was alive with animal frigates, the land with self-moving Krupp cannon, the sky with literally "flying artillery." The modern question between steel plate and steel shot, tried of late by the Merrimac and the Monitor, was tried of old as a principle between ivory tooth and horny scale by many a Megalosaur and Mosasaur, carnivore and pachyderm, each increasing, as now, the force and size of the assailing weapon, as the other increased the thickness and strength of the defensive plate. The physical stuff of which a Nelson and a Napoleon, a Paul Jones and a Farragut, were afterwards made, cruised, perhaps, around the headlands of England, and marched, perhaps, across the wilds of Europe and America, ages before their day, as Dinichthys and Dinosaur, Machairodus and Megathere. Battles of Trafalgar and the Nile, of Marathon and Waterloo, deciding the fate of great animal kingdoms, were fought, to begin with, under far off Triassic and Mesozoic skies. And whether or not Tennyson's lines are true of the future, —

> "And there rained a ghastly dew
> From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue,"

they have been true of the past, the "airy navies" being those of such great reptile birds as the Pteranodon and Pterodactyl, the latter with a wing-spread of twenty-five feet.

What has been the result of this long, ferocious war, as related to the various kinds of armor used by its combatants? The records of the rocks conclusively answer. It has been the overwhelming of nearly all the races and orders that were provided with its massive outside varieties, and the survival and supremacy of those that have been equipped with its inner and finer forms. Orthoceras and Dinichthys, Megalosaur and Megathere, Icthyosaur and Iguanodon, monsters armed with shell and scale, tooth and claw, enormous and terrible, have all without exception gone down in the great life-battle; while those whose weapons were the finer skeleton, the keener sense, the

quicker nerve, the larger brain and the stronger social instinct, faculties good for peace as well as war, — and some that apparently have had no outward fighting-apparatus at all, nothing but inner shrewdness and wisdom, — are the races that have been victorious, and survived. Even the armed ones whose descendants are still on the field, as the lion and the tiger, the eagle and the shark, have evidently held on by virtue of their quickened inner powers, rather than through their outward strength; or else, as with the oyster and the clam, by reason of their insignificance and unprogressiveness, rather than because of their hardened shells. And man, the one that has progressed most of all, that has become the head of the animal kingdom and the lord and master of the earth, — he is the one that, outwardly, is the most unweaponed and defenseless of all; the one whose claws are taper fingers, whose skin every mosquito can puncture, and whose armor of thought has no size or weight whatever.

What is the reason of this result, what the underlying causes why inward development should thus prove itself more effective in the struggle for life than outside strength? They are not hard to find. To begin with, the animals that trusted to exterior arms and armor were less able to adapt themselves to the ever-changing conditions of the earth and of food supply, than those whose weapons were within. The very things which protected them against one set of elements made them often the more exposed to be overcome by another set, — as the heavy fur, so warm for Winter, becomes an intolerable burden under the heats of Summer. The endowments that were efficient against one set of enemies, by reason of their bulk, were inefficient against another set by reason of their unwieldiness, — as the huge frigates, so powerful against each other broadside to, are helpless against the lively little ram that rakes them turning round. And as the struggle went on between thicker plates on the one side and more formidable jaws, claws, teeth and limbs on the other, their weight and size became of themselves in time their owners' worst foes, sinking them in morasses, stranding them on bars, exposing them to be overwhelmed with sudden floods, and at last bearing them down to earth and to extinction by simply their own hugeness. On the other hand, with some disadvantages, the development of the animal's inner powers and parts had, in all these directions, a corresponding gain. When Nature invented her backbone, and put her limbs, flesh, senses, and so many of her soft and vulnerable parts, on its outside, it looked at first like a great military mistake, — like the building of a fort and the putting of its garrison outside of its walls rather than within their protection. But what

a tremendous part this very arrangement of it has acted in all her subsequent operations. The mineral matter its possessors needed to carry about was, in proportion to their size, greatly reduced by it, alike in weight and bulk. How flexible it has proved in the line of adaptations, — ranging all the way from the fish in the sea to the bird in the air, from the snake that crawls to the man that walks, and from the uses of war to the needs of peace. What beauty and dignity it has gathered around it in man's kingly stature and in woman's queenly grace; and how fitly, in the higher conflicts of civilization, it has become the symbol of the statesman's crowning attribute, — his "having backbone." So with each of Nature's other steps in the same direction. What was the sharp tooth as a help, either in defense or attack, as compared with the sharp eye? What the huge limb, clumsily brought down on its object, in contrast with the quickened nerve which, in the same time, with a smaller limb, could rain a score of blows against the selected weak parts of its victim? What the chance of the creature with the strongest claw and the widest range of wood and sea, in its contest with hunger and cold, as measured against one with the hand and mind to weave every fibre that grows into robes of warmth, turn every force of Nature into weapons of war, and lay every land that blooms under contribution for food? If the inner development lost sometimes in its direct fitness for fighting, it made up for it a thousand fold by its larger fitness for peace; and as peace, even in the wildest nature, is at least one of its normal conditions, — is the time, even among beasts, in which to prepare for war, — it is not strange that what was fitted in part for each of these states should have proved, as a whole, the fittest to survive.

Beyond this, just in proportion as a live thing was protected by outward armor, either against the elements or against its foes, the stimulus for its interior development was taken away, the nourishing qualities of its food went to its outside parts, and the freedom of its circulatory system, always needed in the making of a highly differentiated organism, was sacrificed in the interest of its harder shell. It is not improbable that the starting-point of the whole divergence between the animal and vegetable kingdoms, now so broad, was that the original protistic protoplasm out of which they both came, identical in all other respects, was a little more solidified in the one case than in the other, as it still is in their germs, — that early outside protection being fatal to all animal-life development. And when Nature surrounds any creature at its birth with an encasement that is a guard without effort on its own part from all harm, as with the snail, oyster and clam, or develops its teeth, claws and bulk so enormously by inheri-

tance that their mere display protects it from all ordinary assaults, what inducement does the creature have for interior growth, and what sustenance have left for it even should the need arise? It is the animals whose very existence depends on the completeness and activity of their internal equipment, — on their quickness of motion, keenness of sense, and cunning of brain, rather than on their outside covering, — it is these that will necessarily make the most of every variation in the direction of such powers, using them more and more, and be the ones to mount up at last from moner into man. Historically, in the animal kingdom, it is out of the bodily weakest that have come the mentally strongest. Lacking talons, they have developed talents; unable to throttle, they have learned to think. Danger has been their school; difficulty their teacher; and, instead of yielding to the arsenal of outward weapons arrayed against them, they have turned them into helpers, — sharpened their wits against the very teeth of tigers, made the ferocity of the hyena and bear contribute to their fineness of nerve and sense, and the portion of Nature's goods that Megalosaur and Megathere consumed with riotous living in the making of brawn, they have used with economy in the making of brain.

Then, too, the imperfection of their outward armor must have had a very important influence in driving the weak into that mightiest of all military arts, mightier than any tusk or claw or individual accoutrement,— co-operative effort. All animals even of the same species, organized to prey on each other, would naturally be foes at first, and inclined to live apart. Outward shelter meant only the continuance of this separation. What society could the oyster and the clam have with each other? What need of mutual assistance, the Icthyosaur and Megalosaur, fifty or a hundred feet long, and panoplied all over with thick plates? It was only the unprotected that would be under the necessity of overcoming their individual enmities and combining against their protected foes; only the outwardly weak who would be apt learners of the lesson that union is strength. Once learned it became not only a mighty weapon of attack and defense, but the teacher of innumerable other things. The association it involved was a powerful stimulus to mind-development. Liking its benefits, they grew inevitably to like the benefit-givers, — that is, their associates. And thus, under the wonderful alchemy of Evolution, out of the crucible of animal hate in this seething world of ours, stirred with tusk and claw, has come, as much as there is of it, the fine gold of brotherly love, the protective arms into which all weapons are at last to merge.

John C. Kimball.

THE MORAL LAW AND GRAVITATION.

THOUGHT is more subtle than language. The distinctions of thought can often only be indicated with great difficulty by the terms of popular speech. To my mind there is a manifest difference between a Law in the moral sense and a law in the physical or actual sense. A moral law prescribes what men should do. A law of physics or of psychology describes what actually happens or tends to happen. There are laws on our statute-books; but they may be disregarded, and often are disregarded. The law of gravitation is never disregarded; for it is not an ideal rule, but simply a summary and abstract statement of an actual tendency of material bodies. (For the law of gravitation is not that bodies fall to the earth, but that all bodies, the earth included, are attracted to one another directly according to their mass and inversely according to the square of their distance from one another.) The two kinds of law have only this in common, namely, that each denotes something fixed, constant; but the fixedness in the one case is that of an obligation, and in the other of a fact or tendency. It might be well if law were used only in one of these two senses, and not in the other; historically and etymologically it belongs rather to the realm of ethics or politics than to that of science — and it might be better if science would be content with such terms as "the general fact," or "the constant tendency." Still, we may keep the same name for the diverse things, if we always indicate in what sense we use it and are not betrayed into confusing the two senses; if we remember that moral law and matter-of-fact law have *only* this in common, viz., that they each denote what is fixed or constant.

It appears to me that Mr. Gronlund, in THE NEW IDEAL for May, falls into this confusion. He objects to my saying (in "Ethical Religion," p. 31) that the moral law differs from the law of gravitation, in that it does not act necessarily, and says that in that case "Morality would not be a law at all." But because the law of the State, which says in effect, "Thou shalt not steal," or, "Thou shalt not kill," does not act necessarily and is indeed often disregarded, is it any the less a law? Would it only become the law when it was universally obeyed? In the physical or actual sense, Yes; but in the political or moral sense, plainly, No.

In the interests of clear thinking, we must go a step further. Mr. Gronlund says, Morality is a force, though not as active as it may become when the conditions are more favorable. But, as it appears to me, we must distinguish between morality as a law and morality as a force. A law (in the moral sense) is not necessarily a force; it

is an ideal requirement. The moral forces are not the law; but our *hearts, wills and minds,* determining that justice shall be done and the moral requirements be fulfilled. We wish to add to the moral *forces* of the community, to intensify and deepen them; but we cannot possibly add to the moral law or intensify or deepen it. The moral law is what it is (and ever has and ever will be) whether we bring the forces of our nature into harmony with it (and so make them moral forces) or not; it is as fixed in the moral nature of things as gravitation is in the physical nature of things.

WILLIAM M. SALTER.

GENERAL TOPICS.

THE F. R. A. CONVENTION.

The readers of THE NEW IDEAL will be interested to know that the Magazine for July will contain in full the addresses before the Free Religious Association, at its Convention just at hand. The topics, as announced in a general way in the May number, should prove valuable and suggestive.

WORSHIP.

IN the homeward cars, an evening or two ago, while the setting sun made golden glory over fresh green fields new-sprinkled with buttercups, and lengthening shadows outlined fairy grottoes on the edge of swift-speeding woodlands, a cowering, black-robed priest turned his back to it all, to mumble over wordy prayers from a greasy rubric — so worshiping God. . . . May that God give him peace!

In the next seat, lessons over for the day,— school-books under their arms or hanging by a strap from the seat-frame, — a young girl and boy from the high-schools, one hand of each mysteriously hidden (shall we dare to think clasped?) under the grateful edge of the maiden's outer wraps, gazed out together, delight beaming from their eyes, ecstasy, almost, breathing in their breath, as they leaned with one accord towards the car-window, and with low, united voice murmured to each other,— perhaps they had read it in Wordsworth at school that day,—

> "Beauty, a living presence of the earth,
> Surpassing the most fair ideal forms
> That craft of delicate spirits hath composed
> From earth's materials, waits upon my steps,
> Pitches her tent before me as I move,
> An hourly neighbor"—

so worshiping God. And that God *did* give them peace.

"Religion"! Ah, it shall not really have true hold on

the mind and soul of man, nor shall man rise to his highest and holiest, till *in Beauty* he begins to see the real "God," and then strives, by making himself true, pure, beautiful, healthy, and good likewise, to come into "communion" with this God. In no other way than this can man attain unto real truth and harmony with the Spirit-Life which is the origin and real goal of all human life, and of all physical things as well.

All sin and evil and avarice are ugliness and the following of ugliness. How really to see what is exalting — how really to see, with the eye, with the mind, with the heart, with the soul! and then lovingly and loyally to make the *life* the *following* of all the Good and all the Beauty and Might and Marvel that lie encircled in the secret of the worlds — in this might well be gathered up and comprehended the whole duty and glory of man.

Of old time, the Hebrew's great cry was, "Lord, open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy *law*." To-day our aspiration should be, "O for natural openness of sight, that we may behold wondrous things in the universe's possible and offered beauty and good."

UNITARIANISM.

It is a very just and discriminating word, and, withal, a very generous word, that Mr. Frothingham speaks in the present issue concerning Unitarianism. In a different line of thought, Mr. Wm. J. Potter recently uttered an equally discriminating word, touching various religious denominations, Unitarianism included. We quote it below: and we quote it not for criticism's sake, but — as our occasional words concerning Unitarianism, and some other so-called "liberal" denominations, have invariably been — with a simple looking towards greater clearness in religious thinking, and with desire for greater honesty in religious "professions":

A curious anomaly of human history presents itself. The moral and religious leaders of all nations have always asserted that truth is all-powerful, that it is the essence of Almighty Being, that it will make men free and guide them safely; and the mental and moral sense of mankind in general has given assent to these propositions. Yet everywhere, from the times immemorial when Adam, of the ancient legend, attempted concealment in the Garden of Eden, and from the later times when Peter denied and Judas betrayed their master, men have tried to lived by a falsehood. The attempt has always in the end proved to be vain; yet the lesson of its uselessness has been a hard one to learn and has not yet been mastered. Even in the old legend of Genesis, the penetrative eye of Jehovah detected the hiding-place of the disobedient pair and brought them to the light. Peter's falsehood only confounded him with tears of shame; and the lie of Judas was too great for mortal man to bear, and, like the fraud of many a man since, confessed itself in the coward's act of suicide. Still, there are people who betray truth with a kiss and sell her for gold.

Still, there are the cowardly whose minds see the truth but whose hearts are too timid to follow when danger to position or popularity appears. Thus the effort continues to live by a lie. The effort is of manifold grades and kinds, from the minor deceits of trade and social life, which try to protect themselves under the guise of special moral codes for business and society, to the deeds of men who rob a bank of its securities, and then profess amazement that the world does not recognize their operations as in accordance with approved methods of Wall-street finance. It appears again in the sharp maneuvering of partisan politicians to outwit each other in parliamentary law and legislation and in election campaigns. It rises in religious robes in the assembly of Presbyterians to plead that the creed and the catechism remain unrevised, because the very words have become reverend and sacred with age and can now be repeated with new meanings and mental reservations by those who cannot accept them in their original significance. In the Episcopal general convention, for similar reasons, it deprecates, against many conscience-appeals, a revision of the prayer-book, which has guided the worship of so many generations. It lobbies in the National Unitarian conference, of which a large body of the membership now says in respect to the theological phrases of its constitution, "They don't mean anything to us — they are a dead letter — but to a few among us they mean something; and to the world outside they seem to mean a good deal; so don't touch them, but in the interests of harmony and quiet and peace, let them stand there; though on the frontals of our temple, we don't or needn't see them as we pass under." And if, among men who have risen to such conspicuous positions in the world as religious and political leaders, there occur these evidences of carelessness, timidity, and betrayal in the presence of truth's commands, is it any wonder that young people, young men especially, should deem it easier and safer to evade the law of moral truth as it affects personal character, and when tempted into crooked paths for sudden riches or into courses of pleasureable and vicious self-indulgence, should think it may be possible somehow successfully to escape the retribution?

CAUSES FOR INFIDELITY.

A PROMINENT exchange wondered lately, in all apparent innocence, that, after so many centuries of earnest Christian teaching and endeavor, there should still be "infidelity" abroad in the world — and to-day even a possible growing infidelity! Within a month or two, for purposes of ingenuous and sincere study, we have spent numerous Sundays in visiting Unitarian churches in and about Boston — of which visits, and what we saw and heard, we shall perhaps have something to say on a later occasion. Suffice it now, however, if we presume to declare that if what, from our observation, is going on as the regular practice in the so-called *liberal* religious world is the "advance word" of the church to-day, the "rear word" must indeed be flat, stale and unprofitable.

As men and women we look about us from week to week; we see the awful tragedies of life, which throng about us; we see the sins and sorrows, the weaknesses and shortcomings of men and women, and of the young, over the

world; the poverty and the social injustice; — and our hearts are pained, our souls rise in indignation. Knowing the health and temperance, the happiness and beauty which *might be* everywhere; knowing what it is possible for men and women to be and to accomplish, we witness with sorrow the lethargy and indifference of those who might help and save. Parents are neglectful; teachers are neglectful; statesmen are neglectful. And as for the "churches" and "ministers," from whose words and labors, in this new era of the world's thought and knowledge, we might well expect a bond of union of purely human fellowship and sympathy, together with doctrines of helpful, manful, *self-reliant* tenor,— even these still set forth forever, week after week, year after year, only the fantastic, dependent words of an effete past. As the true religious life, the churches as a whole — as a whole, we say; for there are isolated notable exceptions — still eternally set forth only pious meditation on fictitious deities and romantic Christs; and as means of salvation, only the saving sacraments of special religious sects. Between the altogether fictitious, magnified man-god of early human fantasy, and the upholding, evolving Life-Force which is the omnipresent Spirit of advancing Nature, the churches are able to perceive no preference, — or still prefer the fiction. We may deem it doubtful, indeed, if they apprehend at all — even in the least degree — what is the real, the immanent Life-Presence of the worlds. If they do apprehend, they pass by with scorn; while the distorted God of the old theology, because their fathers and the church-fathers served him,— or because of *reasons of their own*, as Mr. Frothingham expressively puts it,— they too still serve, asking no questions. And many there be, even of the newer and more liberal faith, who care more, or seem to care more, for the *old name*, than for the new and life-giving *power*, and who, by themselves holding back, hold the world also back.

Again, between the possible Jesus of history— the man of hopeful, progressive, practical thought and deed — and the "Christ" of theological romance and dogma, the churches seem able to discern no preference,— or still prefer the Christ of romance. If a man loves *Truth*, and strives to pursue what is really true, leaving romance and superstition to go their own way; if he loves *all* helpful men, and speaks of Jesus, among *others*, with awe, following him with the practical regard of example rather than with the cry of "Lord, Lord,"—that is not enough. Such a man is spoken by the average church as a man shutting his eyes to all truth, and denying the world's only saviour. And what is more grievous to be borne than even this spirit of exclusiveness and holding-back on the part of the

"church," is the fact that many professed liberals, also, still seem to care more for the title "Christ" than for the inner spirit of helpfulness and progress in the man who came, years after his death, to be miscalled by that title.

Once more, between the helpful voice of *all the past of humanity,* speaking in Bible and Koran and Veda, in philosophy and science, warning with the warning of discovery and experience,— between this, and the supposed infallible "Word" of a misapprehended deity, the average church seems as yet unable to make any mental or spiritual distinction. And so a little part is taken forever for the mighty and complex Whole, and men think they have all the universe, together with its interfused, throbbing Spirit, between the two lids of a single old-time book.

And so on; — the same ancient fictions and emotional mockeries eternally retold, while still the World waits and sins and sorrows, and men deny their birthright.

The causes for religious "infidelity" to-day are still all about us, and they are more in the Christian church itself, Unitarian and Universalist included, than in any possible wilfulness of man's mind or deliberate perversity of his heart. A Church of Modern Thought, a Church of Human Providence, a Church of Holy Sincerity, a Church of Unbiased Truth, a Church of Natural Rights — and such might be — would disarm "infidelity." No other church will or can.

BOOK NOTES.

Mr. Edwin D. Mead's addresses on the Roman Catholic Church and the Public Schools have been put together in a little volume of a hundred pages, which will be published immediately by George H. Ellis, Boston. The collection includes the address given before the Woman Suffrage League in Boston during the controversy over Swinton's history, the address before the Massachusetts Schoolmasters' Club at the close of the Boston conflict, and the address before the National Educational Association at Nashville, last summer, in the debate with Bishop Keane. These addresses have already been published as separate pamphlets, and of the Nashville address nearly fifty thousand copies have been circulated. Their publication together at this time, when the struggle over the Bennett law in Wisconsin has drawn the attention of the country anew to the whole subject, is opportune. There is almost no phase of the subject which Mr. Mead does not touch in these addresses. What is chiefly worthy of remark is, that although he is the warmest defender of the public school system and the most outspoken critic of the parochial schools, he has treated the Roman Catholics with a careful justice which has won their confidence as has been done, perhaps, by no other of their critics. *The Catholic Review,* the ablest of the Catholic newspapers, wrote last summer: "What we desire to call attention to in these pamphlets is the remarkable fairness with which Mr. Mead treats Catholics and their views. The first fourteen pages of the first essay might have been written by a Catholic. It looks as if, for the first time in American history, Catholics were about to meet in the arena a foeman who knows their strong and weak points as well as his own."